

- 2 -

Commissioner for Patents

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 (and 8-10) under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,252,952 to Kung et al.

The rejection is not understood. Kung et al. teach an Internet Protocol Telephony Network and public switched telephone network, in which closed user groups may be dynamically defined and modified to take advantage of special billing within the closed user groups. Abbreviated dialing within the closed user groups may be used to make dialing more convenient. The closed user groups may include members anywhere in a global network, and may take advantage of the special billing, regardless of whether the members are located in different states and/or countries.

The problem addressed by Kung et al. is therefore one of establishing the closed user groups among users connected to an Internet Protocol (IP) network. The IP network is associated with the PSTN 160 which may be accessed through voice or multimedia gateways. As may be seen in Figs 1, 2 and 4, the PSTN can be accessed through a voice gateway 232 or a multi media gateway 230. However, Kung et al. do not provide any inventive solutions for enabling local number portability within the PSTN.

With respect to the referenced text relied on in the Office Action to establish anticipation, column 10, line 67-column 11 line 3 refers to a "local number portability (LNP) database that indicates the North American Numbering Plan (NANP) and associated prefixes which are open to association with the number portability service". As is well known to persons skilled in the art, the LNP database populated with area codes and exchange codes (prefixes) of exchanges that

- 3 -

Commissioner for Patents

support LNP is used to trigger a query to a service control point (SCP) in the PSTN each time a call is placed to an exchange in the LNP database. This is a well known prior art number portability scheme. With respect to the other references to the text, only the referenced text in columns 5 and 23 deal at all with local number portability, and each refers to the prior art solution, which teaches directly away from the claimed invention. For example, in column 5, lines 47-53, Kung et al. teach that in exemplary embodiments, one or more administration centers 155 may be connected to the IP network 120 and provide billing and local directory number portability administration. The local number portability may be handled by one or more Local Services Management System (LSMS) which may be included in the administration center 155 and/or in the IP central station 200. The LSMS is used to maintain the LNP database, which is used as described in column 26, lines 27-35 to prompt the call manager to query a LNP database for a routing number in a manner well known in the prior art. This contributes nothing to the inventive solution claimed in claims 1-3 and 8-10.

The referenced text in columns 12, 16 and 26 simply include the term "provision" or "provisioning" without reference to local number portability.

As is readily apparent to those skilled in the art, Kung et al. incorporate two prior art LNP solutions into their system. Both the IP LNP and the PSTN LNP require two queries for each call received. The first query is to a local database to determine whether the directory number is associated with an area that supports local number portability. The second query, performed only if the first query returns a positive result, to a LNP database to obtain a routing or a conversion number in a manner well known in the art.

In contrast, the methods claimed in claim 1 claims that local number portability is supported by selecting a gateway (media gateway or line gateway) to

- 4 -

Commissioner for Patents

serve the ported number and re-provisioning the DSCM to address call control messages to the selected gateway. Thus, both of the queries required by the prior art methods used by Kung et al. are eliminated.

In claim 8, the same method is claimed with limits to a line gateway.

Consequently, Kung et al. fail to teach the claimed invention and the rejection of claims 1-3 and 8-10 is traversed.

Claim Rejection -35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kung et al. on the grounds that Kung et al. fail to explicitly show a second DSCM, but that Kung et al. intended such. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Kung et al. fail to teach a DSCM of any kind. Kung et al. teach an IP central station. If it is considered that the IP central station is somehow equivalent to or can be equated with the DSCM, the equivalence is not clear. In the alternative, the Office Action rejects claims 4-7 on the grounds that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to duplicate that which is taught by Kung et al., but there is no basis or support for that position.

Besides, for reasons similar to those set forth above in detail with respect to claims 1-3 and 8-10, no duplication of Kung et al. could or would lead to the inventive solution claimed in claim 4. In accordance with claim 4, directory numbers served by a first distributed switch call manager are ported from an area served by the first to an area served by the second distributed switch call manager by establishing a signaling path through a broadband transport network from the first distributed switch call manager to a media gateway or a line gateway located in the area served by the second distributed switch call manager. Thus, the media gateway or the line gateway is used to provide service to the subscriber having the

- 5 -

Commissioner for Patents

directory numbers ported to the area served by the second distributed switch call manager, but the calls are routed to the first distributed switch call manager as if the numbers had not been ported.

There is nothing taught or suggested by Kung et al. that would lead a person of ordinary skill in art to this solution. In fact, as noted above with respect to claims 1-3 and 8-10, Kung et al. teach using queries sent to a LNP database in order to retrieve number translations for ported numbers. This teaches directly away from the invention claimed in claims 4-7. The rejection of claims 4-7 is thereby traversed.

With respect to claims 11-13, the arguments set forth above apply. The reference to column 15, line 51-column 16 line 10 is not understood and appears to be irrelevant to the invention claimed in claims 11-13. The rejection of claims 11-13 is thereby traversed.

With respect to claim 14, which is an independent claim different than claim 4, the rejection is not understood. The Office Action does not establish a prima facie case for obviousness because the grounds of rejection relies exclusively on the rejection of unrelated claim 4. Claim 14 claims a novel method of local number portability in which the control modules of central offices (service switching points) are decommissioned and their call processing is assigned to a distributed switch call manager (DSCM). Thereafter, local number portability is achieved by changing number translation tables in the DSCM to direct call control messages to the central office to which the directory number has been ported. Kung et al. neither teach nor suggest this solution to local number portability and the rejection of claim 14 is traversed.

- 6 -

Commissioner for Patents

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 22 2003

With respect to claims 15 and 16, which depend from claim 14, it is respectfully submitted for reasons set forth above that Kung et al. fail to teach or suggest the limitations claimed and the rejections of claims 15 and 16 are likewise traversed.

With respect to claim 17, the argument presented in the Office Action is not understood. Claim 17 claims a method by which an area in which local number and service feature portability is enlarged by decommissioning control modules of central offices to permit the components to the central office to be controlled directly by the DSCM. This is neither taught nor suggested by Kung et al. and the rejection of claim 17 is traversed.

For all of the reasons set forth above, this application is considered to be in a condition for immediate allowance. Favourable reconsideration and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OFFICIAL

By



Max R. Wood
Registration No. 40,388
Attorney for Applicant

MRW/ma

Address: OGILVY RENAULT
1981 McGill College Avenue
Suite 1600
Montreal, QC H3A 2Y3